

AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
Legal Department, DL429
Intellectual Property Administration
P. O. Box 7599
Loveland, Colorado 80537-0599

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 10031000-1

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor(s): John F. Corson

Serial No.: 10/788,547

Examiner: Neil N. Turk

Filing Date: February 27, 2004

Group Art Unit: 1743

Title: SCANNER WITH ARRAY ANTI-DEGRADATION FEATURES

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
AUG 07 2006

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria VA 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL LETTER FOR RESPONSE/AMENDMENT

Sir:

Transmitted herewith is/are the following in the above-identified application:

- ☒ Response/Amendment ☐ Petition to extend time to respond
☐ New fee as calculated below ☐ Supplemental Declaration
☒ No additional fee (Address envelope to "Mail Stop Amendments")
☐ Other: (Fee \$ _____)

CLAIMS AS AMENDED BY OTHER THAN A SMALL ENTITY						
(1) FOR	(2) CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT	(3) NUMBER EXTRA	(4) HIGHEST NUMBER PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	(5) PRESENT EXTRA	(6) RATE	(7) ADDITIONAL FEES
TOTAL CLAIMS		MINUS		= 0	X 50	\$ 0
INDEP. CLAIMS		MINUS		= 0	X 200	\$ 0
<input type="checkbox"/> FIRST PRESENTATION OF A MULTIPLE DEPENDENT CLAIM					+ 360	\$ 0
EXTENSION FEE	1 st MONTH 120.00 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 nd MONTH 450.00 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 rd MONTH 1020.00 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 th MONTH 1590.00 <input type="checkbox"/>		
OTHER FEES						\$ 0
TOTAL ADDITIONAL FEE FOR THIS AMENDMENT						\$ 0

Charge \$ 0 to Deposit Account 50-1078. At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account 50-1078 pursuant to 37 CFR 1.25. Additionally please charge any fees to Deposit Account 50-1078 under 37 CFR 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21. A duplicate copy of this transmittal letter is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

John F. Corson

By

Bret E. Field for John Brady
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

Reg. No. 37,620

Date: 08-07-2006

Telephone No. (408) 553-3584

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile
transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office on
the date shown below:

Date of facsimile: 08-07-2006

Typed Name: Donna Macedo

Signature: 

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****AUG 07 2006****VIA FACSIMILE (571) 273-8300**

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT Address to: Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450	Attorney Docket Confirmation No.	10031000-1 7082
	First Named Inventor	John F. Corson
	Application Number	10/788,547
	Filing Date	February 27, 2004
	Group Art Unit	1743
	Examiner Name	Neil N. Turk
	Title	Scanner with Array Anti-Degradation Features

Dear Sir:

This communication is responsive to the office communication dated July 7, 2006.

In the above referenced office communication, the Examiner imposed a restriction requirement, requiring the election of the claims of either:

Group I, i.e., Claims 1-17; or

Group II, i.e., Claims 18-28;

for further prosecution in this application.

The Applicants hereby elect Group I **with traverse**.

The Applicants also respectfully urge the Examiner to rejoin the claims of Group II with the elected claims of Group I for examination in this application for the following reasons.

The MPEP allows an Examiner to examine otherwise patentably distinct sets of claims if to so would not impose an undue burden on the Examiner. M.P.E.P. § 8.03 states that:

**If the search and examination of an entire application
can be made without serious burden, the examiner must
examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims
to independent or distinct inventions.**

Agilent Ref: 10031000-1
United States Application Serial No. 10/788,547

In the present case, the claims of Group II include elements found in the claims of Group I. As such, the search for the claims of Group I should find any relevant prior art relating to the claims of Group II.

Accordingly, little, if any, additional searching should be required for the claims of Group II, and therefore the examination of the claims of Group II together with the claims of elected Group I should impose little, if any, additional burden on the Examiner.

As such, examining the claims of Group II and the claims of elected Group I together in the present application clearly does not impose an undue or serious burden on the Examiner. In the absence of such an undue or serious burden, the Examiner is clearly instructed by the MPEP to examine the entire application. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to rejoin the claims of Group II with the claims of elected Group I and to examine all the claims together in the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any underpayment of fees associated with this communication, including any necessary fees for extensions of time, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1078.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 7, 2006

By: 

Bret E. Field
Registration No. 37,620

AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
Legal Department, DL429
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 7599
Loveland, CO 80537-0599

F:\DOCUMENT\AGIL\150 (10031000)\10031000-1 response to restriction requirement.doc